

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12, 19, and 21 are pending, and no claims are amended, newly added, or canceled herewith.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-12, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35.U.S.C.§112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; and Claims 1-12, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§103(a) as unpatentable over Callaway (U.S. Pat. App. US006275500BI) in view of Haartsen (U.S. Pat. App. US06590928 B1).

In regard to the rejection of Claims 1-12, 19 and 21 under §112, first paragraph, this rejection is traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that the feature "without connecting said each reception device ... with said one transmission device" as recited in Claims 1, 19 and 21 is supported by the specification, page 12, lines 3-8. Therefore, this feature is not a new matter and thus Claims 1-12, 19 and 21 comply with the written description requirement. For these reasons, the applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C.112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

Turning now to the rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a), Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

at least one transmission device;  
a reception information providing device; and  
a plurality of reception devices;  
each transmission device having:  
    a transmission device communication unit configured to  
    carry out communications with the reception information  
    providing device and the reception devices; and  
    a transmission device control unit configured to control  
    the transmission device communication unit to transmit  
    application data to at least one reception device and to transmit

a reception establishing information of each transmission device which is necessary for a reception device to receive the application data transmitted from each transmission device

The outstanding Office Action states on page 5, in the first full paragraph, that “Callaway fails to explicitly disclose that all the parked slaves device communicate each other indirectly through the master device” but Haartsen teaches that slaves use the master as an intermediately device to communicate indirectly with each other.

The independent claims, however, do not recite that that reception devices always communicate indirectly with each other through the reception information providing device as is suggested by the outstanding Action. Instead, the independent claims recite that only the information necessary to *establish* reception is received indirectly from the transmission device through the reception information providing device.

Further, the invention defined in Claims 1, 19 and 21 has nothing to do with a parked device. The Applicants previously canceled claims regarding the park mode.

Additionally, according to Bluetooth 1.0 specification, the reception device typically exchanges some signals with a transmission device to establish the connection with the transmission device. Thereafter, the reception device receives data such as application data from the transmission device.

However, Claim 1 recites that a transmission device transmits a reception establishing information of the transmission device which is necessary for a reception device to receive application data transmitted from the transmission device. Further a reception information providing device receives the reception establishing information and transmits the reception establishing information to a prescribed reception device. Finally, the prescribed reception device receives the reception establishing information.

Thereafter, the prescribed reception device can directly receive application data which is transmitted from the transmission device without connecting itself as a reception device

according to Bluetooth 1.0 specification with the transmission device.<sup>1</sup> Further, Claims 19 and 21 recite analogous features.


Therefore, neither Callaway nor Hartsen describe or suggest transmitting a reception establishing information of each transmission device which is necessary for a reception device to receive the application data transmitted from each transmission device.

Therefore Claims 1, 19 and 21 and Claims depending therefrom, patentably distinguish over Callaway and Hartsen considered individually or in any proper combination.

Consequently, as no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for the claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\JL\213504US\213504US\_AM(7-20-06).DOC

---

<sup>1</sup> See page 13, lines 5-13 of the present specification.